

## **Publication ethics and malpractice statement**

The following are the standards of expected ethical behaviour for all parties involved in publishing in the Journal of Machine Engineering: the author, the journal editor and editorial board, the peer reviewers and the publisher.

We follow closely the industry associations, such as the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). All the articles submitted for publication in the Journal of Machine Engineering are peer reviewed for authenticity, ethical issues and usefulness.

### **DUTIES OF EDITORS**

**Monitoring the ethical standards:** Editorial board is monitoring the ethical standards of scientific publications and takes all possible measures against any publication malpractices.

**Fair play:** Submitted manuscripts are evaluated for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, citizenship, or political ideology.

**Publication decisions:** The editor is responsible for deciding which of the submitted articles should or should not be published. The decision to accept or reject a paper for publication is based on its importance, originality, clarity, and its relevance to the scope of the journal.

**Confidentiality:** The editor and the members of the editorial board must ensure that all materials submitted to the journal remain confidential while under review. They must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the authors, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher.

**Disclosure and conflict of interest:** Unpublished materials disclosed in the submitted manuscript must not be used by the editor and the editorial board in their own research without written consent of authors. Editors always precludes business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards.

**Maintain the integrity of the academic record:** The editors will guard the integrity of the published academic record by issuing corrections and retractions when needed and pursuing suspected or alleged research and publication misconduct. Plagiarism and fraudulent data is not acceptable.

Editorial board always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

**Retractions of the articles:** Journals editors will consider retracting a publication if:

- they have a clear evidence that the findings are unreliable, either as a result of misconduct (e.g. data fabrication) or honest error (e.g. miscalculation or experimental error)
- the findings have previously been published elsewhere without proper cross-referencing, permission or justification (cases of redundant publication)
- it constitutes plagiarism or reports unethical research.

Notice of the retraction should be linked to the retracted article (by including the title and authors in the retraction heading), clearly identify the retracted article and state who is retracting the article. Retraction notices should always mention the reason(s) for retraction to distinguish honest error from misconduct.

Retracted articles will not be removed from printed copies of the journal nor from electronic archives but their retracted status will be indicated as clearly as possible.

## DUTIES OF AUTHORS

**Reporting standards:** Authors of reports of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. The paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. The fabrication of results and making of fraudulent or inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and may cause rejection or retraction of a manuscript or a published article.

**Originality and plagiarism:** Authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others they need to be cited or quoted. Plagiarism and fraudulent data is not acceptable.

For plagiarism detection, every article/manuscript is examined by a professional Similarity Check system available bases on Crossref licence.

**Data access retention:** Authors may be asked to provide the raw data for editorial review, should be prepared to provide public access to such data, and should be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after publication of their paper.

**Multiple or concurrent publication:** Authors should not in general publish a manuscript describing essentially the same research in more than one journal. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

**Authorship of the manuscript:** Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the report study. All those who have made contributions should be listed as co-authors.

The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included in the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

**Acknowledgement of sources:** The proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. The authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the scope of the reported work.

**Fundamental errors in published works:** When the author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

## DUTIES OF REVIEWERS

**Contribution to editorial decisions:** Peer reviews assist the editor in making editorial decisions and may also help authors to improve their manuscript.

**Promptness:** Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its timely review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself/herself from the review process.

**Confidentiality:** All manuscript received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except those authorized by the editor.

**Standards of objectivity:** Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with appropriate supporting arguments.

Acknowledgement of sources: Reviewers should identify the relevant published work that has not been cited by authors. Any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper should be reported to the editor.

Disclosure and conflict of Interest: Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relations with any of the authors, companies, or institutions involved in writing a paper.